



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,873	12/10/2003	Gilles Benoit	13445-030001 / L7 (MIT 10)	8066
26161	7590	02/14/2006	EXAMINER	PIZIALI, ANDREW T
FISH & RICHARDSON PC P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1771	

DATE MAILED: 02/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/733,873	BENOIT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Andrew T. Piziali	1771

All Participants:

(1) Andrew T. Piziali.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(2) Chris Bowley.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 8 February 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

Claims 1-73

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.


- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Discussed the restriction mailed on 9/19/2005. The examiner indicated that the list of generic claims is incorrect and that no claims are generic. In this case "generic" is understood to mean a claim that if allowed would result in automatic allowance of all claims drawn to the species. Not agreement was reached.



ANDREW T. PIZIALI
PATENT EXAMINER